



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/219,071	12/22/1998	RICHARD E. HEADLEY		2289

23910 7590 07/31/2002

FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY, LLP  
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER  
SUITE 400  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2156	

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/219,071	HEADLEY ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
David E. England	2156	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/12/2002.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 40 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 46 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The phrase, “point product”, (page 86, line 22 and page 87, line 13), is vague in the specification. Please explain in more detail the meaning of “point product”.

4. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The phrase, “RM GUI”, (page 91, line 2), is vague in the specification. Please explain in more detail the meaning of “RM GUI”.

5. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The phrase, “PEC communication format”, (page 94, line 20), is vague in the specification. Please explain in more detail the meaning of “PEC communication format”.

***Claim Objections***

Art Unit: 2156

6. 'Claim 40 is objected to because of the following informalities: The word "on", (page 97, line 11), appears to be incorrect and will be assumed that the inventor meant "one". The claim will be interpreted as such. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

8. Claims 1, 7 – 9, 14, 15, 18 – 21, 24 – 35, 44 – 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5781908 to Williams et al., (hereinafter Williams).

9. Referencing claim 1, Williams teaches a job scheduling device for scheduling jobs to run on at least one node of at least one computing platform, comprising:

10. an enterprise scheduling agent installed on each node and configured to launch execution of jobs submitted to the agent, (e.g. col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 25);

11. a presentation layer configured to accept and validate parameters identifying at least one job to be submitted for execution on at least one of said nodes, ( e.g. col. 8, lines 37 - 56); and

Art Unit: 2156

12. a job scheduler configured to allocate at least one job based on said parameters and submit the allocated jobs to at least one enterprise scheduling agent, ( e.g. col. 8, lines 37 - 56).

13. Referencing claim 7, Williams teaches a command line device configured to accept commands regarding administration of jobs submitted to the enterprise scheduling agents, (e.g. col.6 line 59 – col. 8, line 36); and

14. a job administration device configured to communicate said command line to at least one of said enterprise scheduling agents for execution, (e.g. col.6 line 59 – col. 8, line 36).

15. Referencing claim 8, Williams teaches said commands accepted by said command line device include at least one of delete a job and all runs of the job, cancel a job's run, list all jobs, list all jobs by at least one of product code, status, and node, and rerun a job immediately, (e.g. col.6 line 59 – col. 8, line 36).

16. Referencing claim 9, Williams teaches said commands accepted by said command line device include context variables, (e.g. col.6 line 59 – col. 8, line 36); and

17. said enterprise scheduling agent converts said context variables according to a current job and job parameters, and executes said commands, (e.g. col.6 line 59 – col. 8, line 36).

18. Referencing claim 14, Williams teaches a local job repository installed on each of said nodes, (e.g. col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 43);

19. wherein:

20. each local job repository maintains job and job history information on each job submitted to the node where the local job repository is installed, (e.g. col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 43);

21. each local job repository is updated by the enterprise scheduling agent installed on the node where the local job repository is installed, (e.g. col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 43); and
22. said job information includes job parameters needed to execute each job, (e.g. col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 43).

  

23. Referencing claim 15, Williams teaches a job data management device configured to maintain job histories of jobs submitted to each enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 43); and
24. a synchronizing device configured to synchronize each local job repository with the job histories maintained by said job data management device, (e.g. col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 43).

  

25. Referencing claim 18, Williams teaches a notification scripting device configured to execute a notification script having instructions for notifying a user of status of a submitted job, (e.g. col. 6, line 48 – col. 7, line 26);
26. wherein said notification scripting device includes facilities for creating, editing, and selecting a notification script for a specific job, (e.g. col. 6, line 48 – col. 7, line 26).

  

27. Referencing claim 19, Williams teaches said presentation layer includes,
28. a GUI interface that accepts user inputs for scheduling and specifying a job to be submitted, (e.g. col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 55);
29. wherein said GUI interface includes facilities for selection and creation of a scheduling calendar, selection of a start date and time, selection of recurring job run intervals, and selection of an immediate job run, (e.g. col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 55).

30. Referencing claim 20, Williams teaches a resource management device configured to enable a user to locate and view jobs and job runs, (e.g. cols. 7, 8).

31. Referencing claim 21, Williams teaches said resource management device includes an RM GUI for defining an object, representing a job,

32. having,

33. a general properties page having input fields for a label identifying the job, and a description of the job,

34. a description properties page having a selection field for identifying an icon for representing the job, and

35. a repository page having a selection field for identifying a time zone for display of job times, (e.g. cols. 7, 8).

36. Referencing claim 24, Williams teaches said presentation layer includes,

37. a strategy scheduling window configured to allow a user to view, create, modify, and delete schedules for a strategy, (e.g. col. 6, line 47 – col. 7, line 10).

38. Referencing claim 25, Williams teaches a method of scheduling jobs across multiple networked computing platforms, comprising the steps of:

39. determining at least one job based on job parameters for at least one job to be scheduled, (e.g. col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 25);

40. sending said at least one job to at least one scheduling agent maintained on a selected nodes of said computer platforms, (e.g. col. 83, lines 37 – 56); and

41. executing each job on the selected node under management of said scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 83, lines 37 – 56).

42. Referencing claim 26, Williams teaches monitoring progress of the executing job, (e.g. col. 8, lines 37 – 56); and

43. displaying said progress on a progress monitor, (e.g. col. 8, lines 37 – 56).

44. Referencing claim 27, Williams teaches recording each job and a history of each job in a job history repository, (e.g. col. 7, lines 3 – 27).

45. Referencing claim 28, Williams teaches utilizing a job data management device for, retrieving status messages regarding each job sent from a scheduling agent of a selected node of said job, and

46. updating said job history repository based on said status messages, (e.g. col. 3, lines 30 – 35 & col. 4, lines 30 – 59).

47. Referencing claim 29, Williams teaches maintaining a local job repositories, respectively on each of said nodes, each containing job and job history information for each job submitted to the respective node, (e.g. col. 4, lines 30 – 59).

48. Referencing claim 30, Williams teaches synchronizing said job history repository with each local job repository, (e.g. col. 4, lines 30 – 59).

49. Referencing claim 31, Williams teaches retrieving said job parameters from one of a product and a user interface that collects said job parameters, (e.g. col. 8, lines 44 – 56); validating said job parameters, (e.g. col. 8, lines 44 – 56); and allocating a job based on said job parameters, (e.g. col. 8, lines 44 – 56).

50. Referencing claim 32, Williams teaches packaging said job parameters in a PEC communication format, (e.g. cols. 7, 8); and transmitting the packaged job parameters from a computing platform where said job parameters are determined to said scheduling agent maintain on the selected node, (e.g. cols. 7, 8).
53. Referencing claim 33, Williams teaches setting up the selected node to run an application program identified by said job parameters, (e.g. col. 3, lines 3 – 35); executing said application program on the selected node, (e.g. col. 3, lines 3 – 35); and monitoring progress of said application being executed, (e.g. col. 4, line 30 – col. 5, line 9).
56. Referencing claim 34, Williams teaches accepting a command line for administration of jobs submitted to said enterprise scheduling agents, (e.g. col. 6, line 59 – col. 7, line 10); and communicating said command line to at least one of said enterprise scheduling agents for execution, (e.g. col. 7, line 62 – col. 8, line 25).
58. Referencing claim 35, Williams teaches substituting context variables in said command line with data based on said context variable and the job to be administered, (e.g. col. 7, line 3 – col. 8, line 36); and executing the command line, (e.g. col. 7, line 3 – col. 8, line 36).
60. Referencing claim 44, Williams teaches providing a strategy scheduling window that allows a user to view, create, modify, and delete schedules for a strategy, (e.g. col. 6, line 59 – col. 7, line 10).
61. Claims 45 and 46 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

62. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

63. Claims 2 – 6, 12, 13, 17, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams (5781908) in view of Barroux (6182110).

64. As per claim 2, Williams does not teach a job data management device configured to maintain job data and job histories of jobs submitted to each enterprise scheduling agent. Barroux teaches a job data management device configured to maintain job data and job histories of jobs submitted to each enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 9, lines 13 – 23 & col. 11, lines 16 – 48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Barroux with Williams so to keep track and control of jobs when incase of error, it would be easier to track where the error occurred.

65. As per claim 3, Williams does not teach said job histories include information received from each enterprise scheduling agent regarding status of the jobs submitted. Barroux teaches said job histories include information received from each enterprise scheduling agent regarding status of the jobs submitted, (e.g. col. 11, lines 16 – 48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Barroux with Williams so to have a thorough record from agents that have worked on jobs submitted to them.

66. As per claim 4, Williams does not teach said job data management device is utilized by said job scheduler to set parameters in jobs to be submitted to said enterprise scheduling agent. Barroux teaches said job

data management device is utilized by said job scheduler to set parameters in jobs to be submitted to said enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 1, line 59 – col. 2, line 9 & col. 4, line 66 – col. 5, line 44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Barroux with Williams incase of specific jobs that need additional information to complete the job thoroughly.

67. As per claim 5, Williams does not specifically teach a job history repository that saves both jobs and job histories of jobs submitted to each enterprise scheduling agent;

68. wherein each enterprise scheduling agent  
comprises,

69. an agent communicator configured to send and receive messages between said job scheduler and the enterprise scheduling agent,

70. a job manager configured to setup, launch, run, and manage jobs submitted to the enterprise scheduling agent, a data manager configured to update and delete data from said job history repository, and

71. a low level API configured handle internal functions of said enterprise scheduling agent (LES

72. Agent), file management, and message handling functions. Barroux teaches a job history repository that saves both jobs and job histories of jobs submitted to each enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 9, lines 5 - 40);

73. wherein each enterprise scheduling agent  
comprises,

74. an agent communicator configured to send and receive messages between said job scheduler and the enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 36),

75. a job manager configured to setup, launch, run, and manage jobs submitted to the enterprise scheduling agent, a data manager configured to update and delete data from said job history repository, (e.g. col. 7, line 61 – col. 8, line 10), and

76. a low level API configured handle internal functions of said enterprise scheduling agent (LES

77. Agent), file management, and message handling functions, (e.g. col. 3, line 43 – col. 4, line 15 & col. 15, line 57 – col. 16, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Barroux with Williams because having one device with different functionalities make it easier to manipulate data at one station if the job needed.

78. As per claim 6, Williams does not teach an enterprise communicator configured to construct and communicate messages between said job scheduler and each enterprise scheduling agent; and

79. a job data management device configured to maintain job histories of jobs submitted to each enterprise scheduling agent;

80. wherein said data manager updates said job history via enterprise communicator messages sent from the enterprise scheduler to said job data management device.

81. Barroux teaches an enterprise communicator configured to construct and communicate messages between said job scheduler and each enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 18, line 40 – col. 19, line 3); and

82. a job data management device configured to maintain job histories of jobs submitted to each enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 36);

83. wherein said data manager updates said job history via enterprise communicator messages sent from the enterprise scheduler to said job data management device, (e.g. col. 11, lines 16 – 38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Barroux with Williams so to keep track and control of jobs when incase of error, it would be easier to track and fix where the error occurred between the three devices.

84. As per claim 12, Williams does not specifically teach an enterprise communicator configured to send messages between said job scheduler and each of said enterprise scheduling agents. Barroux teaches an enterprise communicator configured to send messages between said job scheduler and each of said enterprise

scheduling agents, (e.g. col. 13, line 61 – col. 14, line 55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Barroux with Williams so to update any information that would be important to modify the job in progress.

85. As per claim 13, Williams does not teach each enterprise scheduling agent is registered at a specific node address that identifies each enterprise scheduling agent with a unique datagroup; and

86. said enterprise communicator encodes each message with at least one destination corresponding to a datagroup to direct each message to at least one enterprise scheduling agent.

87. Barroux teaches each enterprise scheduling agent is registered at a specific node address that identifies each enterprise scheduling agent with a unique datagroup, (e.g. col. 15, line 42 – col. 16, line 13); and

88. said enterprise communicator encodes each message with at least one destination corresponding to a datagroup to direct each message to at least one enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 15, line 42 – col. 16, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Barroux with Williams because if needed one job could be sent to a group of nodes with the purpose of completing a specific job type, this would free up other nodes to perform other specified jobs.

89. As per claim 17, Williams does not teach an autologin device configured to accept login parameters from a user submitting a job;

90. wherein said login parameters are utilized by an enterprise scheduling agent to launch and execute the job submitted.

91. Barroux teaches an autologin device configured to accept login parameters from a user submitting a job, (e.g. col. 15, line 57 – col. 16, line 14);

92. wherein said login parameters are utilized by an enterprise scheduling agent to launch and execute the job submitted, (e.g. col. 15, line 57 – col. 16, line 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to combine Barroux with Williams because it would make completing jobs faster than having an end user entering parameters.

93. As per claim 40, Williams does not teach accepting a scheduling calendar identifying at least one of execution times and intervals for at least one of said jobs; and

94. executing said jobs on selected nodes at the times and intervals identified in the calendar.

95. Barroux teaches accepting a scheduling calendar identifying at

least one of execution times and intervals for at least one of said jobs, (e.g. col. 4, lines 15 – 27); and

96. executing said jobs on selected nodes at the times and intervals identified in the calendar, (e.g. col. 4, lines 15 – 27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Barroux with Williams so a user would not have to type in parameters every time a user wanted to view the status of a job.

97. Claims 10 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams (5781908) in view of Shroyer (6160988).

98. As per claim 10, Williams does not specifically show the use of a point product device configured to provide a communication link between said enterprise scheduling agent and at least one product submitting jobs to said job scheduling device; wherein said point product device communicates job status, job logfile, setup, cancel, job parameter functions, and requests between each enterprise scheduling agent and said at least one product. Shroyer does teach the use of a point product device configured to provide a communication link between said enterprise scheduling agent and at least one product submitting jobs to said job scheduling device; wherein said point product device communicates job status, job logfile, setup, cancel, job parameter functions, and requests between each enterprise scheduling agent and said at least one product, (e.g. col. 18, lines 28 – 52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shroyer with Williams because the more parameters a job has to distinct itself the less likely a user will mistake it for a different job that has similar parameters. Also if a device or user needs to update a parameter, the device or user would want the parameters transferable to their node.

99. As per claim 36, Williams does not teach communicating data, including at least one of job status, job logfile, setup, cancel, job parameter functions, and requests for said data between a product and each enterprise scheduling agent. Shroyer teaches communicating data, including at least one of job status, job logfile, setup, cancel, job parameter functions, and requests for said data between a product and each enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 18, lines 28 – 52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shroyer and Williams because the user or a device that needs the parameters, would want them transferable to there node.

100. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams (5781908) in view of Shroyer (6160988) and in further view of Barroux (6182110).

101. As per claim 11, Shroyer does not teach a job administration device configured to accept command line inputs and communicate said command line inputs to at least one enterprise scheduling agent;

102. a job data management device configured to maintain job histories of jobs submitted to each enterprise scheduling agent; and

103. an enterprise communicator configured to send messages between at least one of said job scheduler, point product device, job administration device, and job data management device and each of said enterprise scheduling agents. Barroux teaches a job administration device configured to accept command line inputs and

Art Unit: 2156

communicate said command line inputs to at least one enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 18, line 40 – col. 19, line 3);

104. a job data management device configured to maintain job histories of jobs submitted to each enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 36); and

105. an enterprise communicator configured to send messages between at least one of said job scheduler, point product device, job administration device, and job data management device and each of said enterprise scheduling agents, (e.g. col. 13, line 61 – col. 14, line 55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Barroux with the combined system of Williams and Shroyer so a user could modify, make changes and manage any job problems if needed and to also have redundancy in error checking when sending messages to different devices for job management.

106. Claims 16, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams (5781908) in view of Jerome et al. (6323882) (hereinafter Jerome).

107. As per claim 16, Williams does not specifically teach a progress monitor configured to monitor and display execution of at least one of said jobs; wherein:

108. said progress monitor provides a visual display of, an identification of said job and a current phase of said job, a percentage complete of said job, and a percentage complete of said current phase. Jerome teach a progress monitor configured to monitor and display execution of at least one of said jobs; wherein:

109. said progress monitor provides a visual display of, an identification of said job and a current phase of said job, a percentage complete of said job, and a percentage complete of said current phase, (e.g. col. 10, line 51 – col. 11, line 15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Jerome with Williams because it allows the users to have a more defined view of how the jobs are being operated on.

Art Unit: 2156

110. As per claim 41, Williams does not teach providing a description of at least one of said jobs, including a written description, a label, and an icon selected to represent said job; and

111. identifying a time zone for display of job times. Jerome teaches providing a description of at least one of said jobs, including a written description, a label, and an icon selected to represent said job, (e.g. col. 9, lines 15 – 65); and

112. identifying a time zone for display of job times, (e.g. col. 9, lines 15 – 65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Jerome with Williams because it allows the users to have a more defined view of how the jobs are being operated on.

113. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams (5781908) in view of Bromley et al. (5819263) (hereinafter Bromley).

114. As per claim 22, Williams does not teach objects defined by said resource management device comprise,

115. a hierarchy of folders including at least one of an all jobs folder, a jobs by group folder, a job by node folder, a jobs by product folder, a jobs by type folder, and a jobs by user folder. Bromley teaches objects defined by said resource management device comprise,

116. a hierarchy of folders including at least one of an all jobs folder, a jobs by group folder, a job by node folder, a jobs by product folder, a jobs by type folder, and a jobs by user folder, (e.g. col. 15, lines 30 – 47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bormley with Williams because it would keep all the information that needs to be saved in an organized manner.

117. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams (5781908) in view of Bromley et al. (5819263) (hereinafter Bromley), and Russell et al. (5537550) (hereinafter Russell).

118. As per claim 23, William does not specifically teach said all jobs folder includes folders, including, an all jobs any status folder listing jobs regardless of status and associated job history of each job, an all runs by status folder listing jobs according to status,

119. including completed runs, failed runs, not started runs, preempted runs, running runs, and stopped runs, a held jobs folder listing jobs that are held and can be scheduled for a later time,

120. and a scheduled jobs folder listing jobs that are scheduled to run. Bromley and Russell teaches folders, including, an all jobs any status folder listing jobs regardless of status and associated job history of each job, an all runs by status folder listing jobs according to status, (e.g. Bromley, col. 15, lines 30 – 62),

121. including completed runs, failed runs, not started runs, preempted runs, running runs, and stopped runs, (e.g. Russell, col. 13, line 62 – col. 14, line 14),

122. a held jobs folder listing jobs that are held and can be scheduled for a later time, and a scheduled jobs folder listing jobs that are scheduled to run, (e.g. Bromley, col. 15, lines 30 – 62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Russell with the combined system of Williams and Bromley because of the visual convenience of seeing a folder with information as apposed to a database.

123. Claims 37 – 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams (5781908) in view of Russell et al. (5537550) (hereinafter Russell).

124. As per claim 37, Williams does not teach registering each enterprise scheduling agent at a node address that identifies the registered enterprise scheduling agent with a unique datagroup;

125. communicating jobs and job administration commands and requests with each enterprise scheduling agent via messages; and

126. encoding each message sent to a recipient enterprise scheduling agent with at least one destination corresponding to a datagroup that directs said message to the recipient enterprise scheduling agent. Russell teaches registering each enterprise scheduling agent at a node address that identifies the registered enterprise scheduling agent with a unique datagroup, (e.g. col. 13, line 62 – col. 14, line 14);

127. communicating jobs and job administration commands and requests with each enterprise scheduling agent via messages, (e.g. col. 10, lines 1 – 33); and

128. encoding each message sent to a recipient enterprise scheduling agent with at least one destination corresponding to a datagroup that directs said message to the recipient enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 28, lines 10 – 27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Russell with Williams because it is more efficient to send specific messages or jobs to a specific group that deals with a specific job this would free up time and space for other messages or jobs to be processed on other nodes.

129. As per claim 38, Williams does not teach retrieving autologin parameters from a user scheduling an autologin job; and

130. launching execution of said job utilizing said autologin parameters. Russell teaches retrieving autologin parameters from a user scheduling an autologin job, (e.g. col. 45, lines 10 – 27); and

131. launching execution of said job utilizing said autologin parameters, (e.g. col. 45, lines 10 – 27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Russell with Williams because of the convenience of the user not having to login parameters.

132. As per claim 39, Williams does not specifically teach retrieving a notification script for a job being submitted; and

133. executing the notification script on at least one of completion of said job and at a requested status point. Russell teaches retrieving a notification script for a job being submitted, (e.g. col. 6, lines 21 – 61); and

134. executing the notification script on at least one of completion of said job and at a requested status point, (e.g. col. 6, lines 21 – 61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Russell with Williams because it is an efficient way for a user to acknowledge another job completion or status therefore, allowing a user to assign another specific job to the same node or group.

135. Claims 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams (5781908) in view of Bromley et al. (5819263) (hereinafter Bromley).

136. As per claim 42, Williams does not teach placing information about job times and status in an object containing folders, each folder identifying a categorization of jobs contained therein, including, an all jobs folder, a jobs by group folder, a jobs by node folder, a jobs by product folder, a jobs by type folder, and a jobs by user folder. Bromley teaches placing information about job times and status in an object containing folders, each folder identifying a categorization of jobs contained therein, including, an all jobs folder, a jobs by group folder, a jobs by node folder, a jobs by product folder, a jobs by type folder, and a jobs by user folder, (e.g. col. 15, lines 30 – 47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bromley with Williams because it would keep all the information that needs to be saved in an organized manner.

137. As per claim 43, Williams does not teach organizing said all jobs folder to maintain additional folders, including, at least one of, an all jobs any status folder listing jobs regardless of status and associated job history of each job,

138. an all runs by status folder listing jobs according to status, including completed runs, failed runs, not started runs, preempted runs, running runs, and stopped runs,

139. a held jobs folder listing jobs that are held and can be scheduled for a later time, and a scheduled jobs folder listing jobs that are scheduled to run. Bromley teaches organizing said all jobs folder to maintain additional folders, including, at least one of, an all jobs any status folder listing jobs regardless of status and associated job history of each job, (e.g. col. 15, lines 30 – 47),

140. an all runs by status folder listing jobs according to status, including completed runs, failed runs, not started runs, preempted runs, running runs, and stopped runs, (e.g. col. 16, line 2 – col. 17, line 56),

141. a held jobs folder listing jobs that are held and can be scheduled for a later time, and a scheduled jobs folder listing jobs that are scheduled to run, (e.g. col. 16, line 2 – col. 17, line 56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bromley with Williams because it would keep all the information that needs to be saved in an organized manner.

### *Conclusion*

142. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

143. a. Engel et al. U. S. Patent 6115393 discloses Network Monitoring.

144. b. Hube U. S. Patent 5517316 discloses Apparatus and method for saving/storing job run information generated by processing a job on a printing machine.

145. c. Fielding et al. U. S. Patent 6012084 discloses Virtual network communication services utilizing internode message delivery task mechanisms.

146. d. Rubin et al. U. S. Patent 5825361 discloses Dynamic graphical system configuration utility.

Art Unit: 2156

• Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 703-305-5333. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alvin Oberley can be reached on 703-305-9761. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are none for regular communications and none for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is none.

David E. England  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2156

de   
July 26, 2002

  
JOHN A. FOLLANSBEE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

**Attachment for PTO-948 (Rev. 03/01, or earlier)**  
**6/18/01**

**The below text replaces the pre-printed text under the heading, "Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes," on the back of the PTO-948 (Rev. 03/01, or earlier) form.**

**INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES**

**1. Correction of Informalities -- 37 CFR 1.85**

New corrected drawings must be filed with the changes incorporated therein. Identifying indicia, if provided, should include the title of the invention, inventor's name, and application number, or docket number (if any) if an application number has not been assigned to the application. If this information is provided, it must be placed on the front of each sheet and centered within the top margin. If corrected drawings are required in a Notice of Allowability (PTO-37), the new drawings **MUST** be filed within the **THREE MONTH** shortened statutory period set for reply in the Notice of Allowability. Extensions of time may **NOT** be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b) for filing the corrected drawings after the mailing of a Notice of Allowability. The drawings should be filed as a separate paper with a transmittal letter addressed to the Official Draftsperson.

**2. Corrections other than Informalities Noted by Draftsperson on form PTO-948.**

All changes to the drawings, other than informalities noted by the Draftsperson, **MUST** be made in the same manner as above except that, normally, a highlighted (preferably red ink) sketch of the changes to be incorporated into the new drawings **MUST** be approved by the examiner before the application will be allowed. No changes will be permitted to be made, other than correction of informalities, unless the examiner has approved the proposed changes.

**Timing of Corrections**

Applicant is required to submit the drawing corrections within the time period set in the attached Office communication. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Failure to take corrective action within the set period will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application.